

## **REMARKS**

**[0010]** Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims **1, 7 and 21-26** are currently pending
- **Claims 8-16** are canceled herein
- **Claim 1** is amended herein
- New **claims 21-26** are added herein

**[0011]** Support for the amendments is found in the specification at least at pages 74, 57 and 26.

**[0012]** If the Examiner's reply to this Response is anything other than allowance of all pending claims, then Applicant formally requests the Examiner to contact the undersigned attorney to quickly and efficiently resolve any issues.

**[0013]** Applicant encourages the Examiner to call and schedule a date and time for a telephone communication that is most convenient for both of us. Alternately, Applicant also encourages email communication in lieu of telephone communication. Applicant's attorney's contact information may be found on the last page of this response.

### **§ 112 2nd Paragraph**

**[0014]** Claims 10-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2, as allegedly being indefinite. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

**[0015]** Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of expediting prosecution and without acquiescing in the propriety of the Office's rejections, Applicant herein cancels these claims making the rejections moot.

## **Cited Documents**

**[0016]** The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- Wolczko: Wolczko, "Using a Tracing Java Virtual Machine to Gather Data on Behaviour of Java Programs".
- Howard: Howard, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0022172
- Goodridge: Goodridge et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,848,393
- Inoue: Inoue et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,303,357

## **§ 103 Rejections**

**[0017]** Claims 1, 8-10, 12, 12 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Wolczko in view of Howard.

**[0018]** Claims 7 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Wolczko in view of Howard and further in view of Goodridge et al.

**[0019]** Claims 13-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Wolczko in view of Howard and further in view of Inoue et al.

**[0020]** Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections. Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of expediting prosecution and without acquiescing in the propriety of the Office's rejections, Applicant herein amends claim 1, adds new claims 21-26 and cancels claims 8-10, 12 and 16.

**[0021]** In light of the amendments presented herein, Applicant respectfully asserts the references fail to teach or suggest:

wherein the instruction to execute in the alternate execution mode also comprises a switch indicating the alternate execution mode, wherein the switch activates a corresponding hook statement within a cmdlet base class from which commands are derived, wherein the hook statement invokes the method provided by the command line operating environment to execute in the alternate execution mode

**[0022]** In fact, in a communication from the Examiner on March 30, 2009, Applicant understood the Examiner to state that claim 1 as amended to include the features shown above is “most likely” allowable. Applicant also understood that the Examiner would have to confirm this with her supervisor. Applicant sincerely thanks the Examiners for this indication and her cooperation.

**[0023]** Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 1 and new claims 21, and 24 (which include similar subject matter as independent claim 1) and their dependent claims also stand allowable.

## **Conclusion**

**[0024]** Applicant submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned representative for the Applicant before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC  
Representative for Applicant

\_\_\_\_\_/David K. Sakata/\_\_\_\_\_  
David K. Sakata(davids@leehayes.com; 509-944-4716)  
Registration No. 59,949

Dated: 6/3/2009

Reviewer/Supervisor: Robert G. Hartman (rob@leehayes.com; 509-944-4765>)  
Registration No. 58,970